

III. REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-12, 15-17 and 19-22 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 10 and 17 are amended. Claims 1-3, 5-12, 15-17 and 19-22 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Gadish (US 6202087). Applicant respectfully traverses the 35 USC 102(b) rejections for the reasons provided below.

Applicant does not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserves the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicant reserves the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application.

A. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-3, 5-12, 15-17 and 19-22 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection over Gadish, Applicant asserts that Gadish does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention.

Specifically regarding the Office's rejections of claim 1 (and similarly claims 10 and 17), Applicant submits that Gadish fails to teach each and every feature of claim 1 (and similarly claims 10 and 17).

Claim 1 (and similarly claims 10 and 17) recites "a system for detecting improper requests." Gadish does not teach this feature. The Office alleges that C.2 lines 36-48 and 61-65 teach this feature. Office Action p.3. A review of this citation does not reveal a teaching of "detecting" and does not reveal a teaching of "detecting improper requests." Gadish states, in part, "there is provided a system for replacing an error

message with a non-error message when a query is non-resolvable.” Gadish C.2 lines 36-38.

Moreover, claim 1 (and similarly claims 10 and 17) recites “wherein a request is deemed improper if a message body associated with the request has a zero length.” The Office alleges that C.2 lines 36-48 and 61-65 teach this feature. Office Action p.3. A review of the sections of Gadish cited by the Office and Gadish in its entirety does not reveal a disclosure remotely similar to this feature.

For all the above reasons, it is clear that Gadish does not teach each and every feature of Applicant’s invention. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 1 (and similarly claims 10 and 17) is not anticipated by Gadish.

With respect to the dependent claims, Applicant herein incorporates the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. Furthermore, Applicant submits that all dependant claims are allowable based on their own distinct features. Since the cited art does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

IV. CONCLUSION

In addition to the above arguments, Applicant submits that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicant reserves the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/David E. Rook/

David E. Rook
Reg. No.: 40,790

Date: February 13, 2009

Hoffman, Warnick LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)